DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 552 CS 001 494

AUTHOR Reiter, Arlene
TITLE The Possible Interference of Black Dialect on the Comprehension of Beginning Standard Reading Materials.
PUB DATE Oct 74
NOTE 85p.; M.Ed. Thesis, Rutgers University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Reading; Elementary Education; Grade 3; *Negro Dialects; Oral Reading; *Reading Comprehension; *Reading Materials; *Reading Research; Silent Reading; Standard Spoken Usage; Syntax; Vocabulary

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the effect of black dialect upon the comprehension of standard reading material by using 50 third-grade students. A sentence repetition test was administered individually to each subject to select pupils for either the standard or the dialect group. Subjects were tested for oral comprehension and silent reading comprehension. No significant differences were found between the standard and the dialect group in oral comprehension. However, a significant difference was found between the scores of the two groups on the silent reading comprehension section of the test. The results of this study indicate that black dialect speakers are more proficient at understanding oral standard English than was formerly supposed. It was suggested that there is great overlap in the syntax and vocabulary of standard and non-standard English, and it is this common core which must be used to the advantage of all children. (SW)

ED 098552

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE POSSIBLE INTERFERENCE OF BLACK DIALECT ON THE COMPREHENSION OF BEGINNING STANDARD READING MATERIALS

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY

OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

OF

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY

BY

ARLENE REITER

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF

MASTER OF EDUCATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Arlene Reiter
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY OCTOBER, 1974

APPROVED: Joseph Zelnick

Josephine J. Goldwater

Wayne Dwyer

DEAN:

CS 001 494

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Expressions of sincere appreciation and thanks to the dissertation committee: Dr. Joseph Zelnick, Chairman, for his extensive knowledge of the subject, his guidance, advice and encouragement; Dr. James Swalm for his support and suggestions; and Ms. Jody Goldsmith for her valuable knowledge and understanding of issues in education.

My sincere thanks to the principal, teachers and students at Livingston School, New Brunswick, who make it possible to collect the data for this research paper.

To Gloria Lukacs many thanks for continued help during my years at Rutgers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES v

Chapter

I. THE PROBLEM 1

Background of the Problem
Statement of the Problem
Hypotheses
Importance of the Study
Definition of Terms
Limitations of the Study

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 10

Viewpoints on Divergent Speakers
Summary

III. PROCEDURE 39

Introduction
Population
Selection of Materials
Administration of the Tests
Treatment of the Data

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION 49

Hypotheses
Discussion

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter		Page
V.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	55
	Summary Conclusions Suggestions for Further Research	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	. . . . .	62
APPENDIX A -	SENTENCE REPETITION TEST	67
APPENDIX B -	TRANSCRIPTION SHEET FOR THE SENTENCE REPETITION TEST	70
APPENDIX C -	PRIZES FOR MARIA	74
APPENDIX D -	THE NEW WAY TO EAT	78

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Mean Non-Language IQ Scores for the Standard and Dialect Groups Based on the Short Form of the California Test of Mental Maturity	41
2.	Difference Between Mean Scores of Standard and Dialect Groups on Standard Sentences from the Sentence Repetition Test	43
3.	Difference Between Mean Scores for the Standard and Dialect Groups on Dialect Sentences from the Sentence Repetition Test	43
4.	Differences Between the Mean Scores of Selections Read Aloud to the Standard and Dialect Groups	50
5.	Differences Between the Mean Scores for Silent Reading Comprehension in the Standard and Dialect Groups . . .	51

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Background of the Problem

The inner-city black child is failing in our schools in ever increasing numbers, despite the great amount of money being spent on remedial programs. Charles Silberman (1964) states that the public school, as the one institution with which every black slum child comes into prolonged contact, offers the greatest opportunity to dissolve the cultural barrier that helps to block his upward mobility. The schools are not meeting the needs of today's society which requires masses of educated men. The root of the problem is that the black slum child is not learning to read properly in the first two or three years of school. Baratz (1969) writes that failure to acquire functionally adequate reading skills not only contributes to alienation from the school as a social institution (and therefore encourages dropping out), but it goes on to insure failure in mainstream job success.

Goodman (1969) reports that it is much easier to learn to read one's mother tongue than a foreign

language, one which the learner does not speak. Each of us speaks a particular dialect of a language which is distinguished from all other dialects by certain features such as its sounds, some of its grammar, and some of its vocabulary. Dialects differ in intonation, pitch, stress, and rhythm. No dialect should be labeled sloppy, bad, or sub-standard.

Every child brings to school five or six years of proficiency in his oral language. The child's language is closely intertwined with the culture of his community, and he has had a great deal of practice in mastering his oral language in his interaction with his peers and his family. Goodman (1969) states that the child's language embodies the cultural values and structures the way in which he may perceive his world and communicate his reactions to others.

Children who speak non-standard English or black dialect are confronted with different realities upon entering school than the speakers of standard English. While the speaker of so called standard English is assured of seeing his language mirrored in text and teacher's speech, the speaker of black dialect discovers a "mismatch." The language he brings to school is not, with respect to certain grammatical features, the

language of text or teachers. Things sound funny because they do not fit within the language norms of his dialect. Baratz (1969) emphatically states that it must be recognized by educators that the black ghetto child is speaking a significantly different language from that of his middle-class peers and teachers. Rejection of the child's language as pathological, disordered, lazy speech by teachers can lead directly to reading difficulties and subsequent school failure. This attitude on the part of the school quickly teaches the child to regard himself as intellectually inadequate, and therefore, of low self-worth and low social value.

Statement of the Problem

What is the effect of Black Dialect upon the comprehension of standard reading material?

Hypotheses

1. There will be no significant difference between speakers of Black Dialect and non-dialect speakers in the comprehension of oral reading material.

2. There will be no significant difference between speakers of Black Dialect and non-dialect speakers in the comprehension of material read silently.

Importance of the Study

A great deal has been written about the relationship between oral language skills and the acquisition of reading skills. Claims about the comprehension of standard English reading material by lower class black children vary greatly. A great deal of research remains to be done in this area, for definitive empirical evidence is still lacking on this question. Although there is apparent agreement on the existence of black dialect and its possible role in reading retardation in black children, there remains a considerable difference of opinion among linguists (Labov, 1970; Stewart, 1969) as to the amount of linguistic interference, the exact source of that interference, and even the amount of bidialectalism among children who speak non-standard English.

Most scholars would not argue that the speakers of black dialect is going to understand as little standard English as a monolingual German speaker reading English, but many authorities (Baratz, 1969; Labov, 1967) feel that there is important and inevitable information loss for the speaker of black dialect who learns to read in standard English.

Very real, describable differences do exist between standard English and black dialect, and it is not unreasonable to expect that some measure of dialect interference could occur once the two dialects meet in the mind of the beginning reader. Kenneth Goodman (1969) made an important hypothesis several years ago: "The more divergence there is between the dialect of the learner and the dialect of learning, the more difficult will be the task of learning to read." Many authorities would still agree with this hypothesis; however Goodman (1973) now offers a new hypothesis:

> The only special disadvantage which speakers of low-status dialects suffer in learning to read is one imposed by teachers and schools. Rejection of their dialects and educators' confusion of linguistic difference with linguistic deficiency interferes with the natural process by which reading is acquired and undermines the linguistic self-confidence of divergent speakers.

In a recent study Goodman (1973) found that shifts from the author's to the reader's dialect in oral reading did occur among most of the readers. These shifts were never entirely consistent. Less proficient readers showed more dialect involvement, but no clear cause-effect evidence was found. This study demonstrated that speakers of non-standard English can be proficient readers; however, it does not show that dialect

difference or dialect rejection is not a cause of difficulty in learning to read for speakers of non-standard English. Goodman (1973) states that the children in his study and urban children, in general, appear to acquire receptive control over other people's dialects. In order to get along in the larger community, one must be able to understand what teachers, policemen, store clerks, and other high status people are saying. This does not mean that the black dialect speaker speaks like the standard English speaker, but that what they find in print is not as hard to understand as was formerly thought.

Goodman feels that rejection or correction by the teacher of any dialect-based miscue hinders the reader in using his own linguistic competence. Word for word accuracy becomes the goal, not meaning. Goodman (1973) states that by encouraging divergent speakers to use their language competence, both receptive and productive, and accepting their dialect-based miscues, dialect differences will be minimized.

The important point to be noted is that Goodman's study did not conclusively show that dialect interference is not a cause of reading retardation. Whether the cause of this interference is inherent in the

dialect differences themselves or is the result of teacher ignorance of and rejection of the non-standard dialect still needs to be borne out by further research.

MacGinitie (1973) states that there is still little evidence on the question of whether written standard English differs so much from the urban child's speech that reading standard material is difficult for that reason alone. He feels that there is not yet an answer to the empirical question of whether dialect speaking children will make faster progress in learning to read standard English by using standard materials from the beginning or materials printed in the child's own dialect.

Before we commence to develop reading programs for non-standard dialect speakders, we must recognize that little "hard" data has been published which offers conclusive evidence as to whether or not dialect interference occurs in the reading process. Further research is sorely needed before reasonable statements can be made with regard to this question.

Definition of Terms

Comprehension. "It is the very core of the reading process. Comprehension involves the problem of meaning. It involves both thought process and the nature of language." (Fry, E. Reading Instruction for Classroom

and Clinic. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972, pp. 135-136).

Divergent Speaker. "The child who speaks a dialect different from that which the school, text, or teacher treats as standard. . . . Divergent is a good term because it is neutral as a value term. . . ." (Goodman in Baratz and Shuy, 1969, p. 15.)

Oral Comprehension. For purposes of this study, oral comprehension means the selection read aloud by the investigator to the subjects.

Dialect. "A variety of language, regional or social, set off (more or less sharply) from other varieties by (more or less clear) features of pronunciation, grammar or vocabulary." (McDavid, R. I. "The Dialects of American English." In N. A. Francis, The Structure of American English. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1958.)

Language. A language is an orderly system of communication with a "predictable sound pattern, grammatical structure and vocabulary." (Baratz, 1969, p. 95.)

Black. This terminology is used to identify the racial group associated with the particular non-standard dialect studied herein.

Non-Standard Black Dialect. A non-standard dialect is the collective speech patterns of a subcultural group that does not have the prestige of the

collective speech patterns (standard English) of the dominant cultural group (the middle class). The variety of English spoken by most disadvantaged black people is generally termed non-standard black dialect by linguists; it is recognized, however, that variation among non-standard black dialect speakers exists. (Johnson, 1968.)

Standard English. "A socially unmarked variety of spoken American English used as a reference point in school language instruction to increase the individual's repetoire of important and useful ways of communicating. This variety of American English is often heard on network radio and television newscasts." (Horn, 1970.)

Limitations of the Study

The data should be interpreted in the light of different procedures used for the oral and silent reading tasks. The questionsin the oral comprehension task were pre-read to the pupils whereas in the silent reading task the pupils had to read the selection as well as the questions silently. The oral comprehension task may have been mitigated, but since two virtually different language processes were being tested, this factor may not be of great importance.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

It is essential to understand the role that language plays in the child's life by the time he gets to school, whatever form he brings with him. A child's language is an integral part of him; if it is rejected, he is rejected. What is most crucial is that his language is his medium of learning. That is what he has been using to organize his experiences, to think with, to talk over his needs, his reactions to the world, his emotions. "When the school undermines a child's language, it undermines his ability to learn," states Goodman (1969b).

This study is based on the recognition of the primacy of oral language. Ruddell (1966) writes:

> Oral language development serves as the underlying base for the development of reading and writing achievement. The child's ability to comprehend written materials through reading and to express himself through written communication appears directly related to his maturity in the speaking and listening phases of language development.

Viewpoints on Divergent Speakers

Before exploring the differences between the language of lower class blacks as opposed to middle class whites, it is essential to examine some environmental factors which may affect language development. It then becomes possible to organize this survey of the research around one central question: Is the culturally disadvantaged child's language different or deficient?

Environmental Differences That Influence Language

Much of the current literature about teaching the disadvantaged child does not extend beyond the listing of characteristics commonly ascribed to children from deprived backgrounds. Cuban (1970) points to the following generalities picked at random from the literature on the "culturally deprived." They have a low self-concept; parents frequently place home responsibilities above school attendance; they are retarded in reading; they are non-verbal; their language is restricted; many are unable to speak in whole sentences; they dislike school, often fail and drop out; they are often members of disintegrating families with many problems such as divorce, desertion,

narcotics, and chronic illness. Wood (1970) warns that it is a very grave error to think that an effective educational program could be planned for an individual child or a small group of children solely on the basis of bald generalizations of the social and cultural characteristics of an entire group of children.

Social scientists have depicted disadvantaged black children in relation to middle-class white youngsters and schools. Paul Goodman (1967) states that the result is that discrepancies between established norms of language, behavior, and achievement are seen as abnormalities in the disadvantaged child. The implication here is that the child is to blame for his deficiencies. Stated in the school's language, the child's environment is such that one can expect him to be inarticulate, dull, and unable to learn to read. Baratz (1969) is appalled that an educational system that has been ineffective in coping with teaching inner-city children to read, readily treats this failure as if it were due to intellectual deficits of the child rather than to methodological inadequacies in teaching procedures. Thus, the system is unable to teach the child to read, but very quickly teaches him to regard himself as intellectually inadequate, and

therefore, of low self-worth and low social value.

Research studies show that the lower class child may have more deficiencies in his environment than the middle class child. Goodwin Watson (1964) wisely cautioned that poor children are diverse individuals, and no amount of research or generalization can compress that diversity into a chart or a control group. A number of studies apply to some disadvantaged children but by no means to all of them as a group.

Black (1968) reports that lower class children often come to school with minimal concepts of directionality, position, relative size, and color. Such a child may have been exposed to few, if any, books or magazines. The free time of lower class adults is necessarily limited because of economic stress, and the child does not regularly see adult models engage in reading as a natural daily activity.

Reissman (1966) states that to say that disadvantaged black children are inarticulate and nonverbal is a gross oversimplication. He suggests that these youngsters are quite verbal in out-of-school situations with their peers and family. A child's language is so well learned and so deeply embossed on his subconscious that little effort is involved for

him in its use. If the child finds his language emphatically rejected by teachers who constantly want to show him the "right" way to say something, this child will become non-verbal. Reissman strongly urges educators to accept the student at his level of usage. The child must be encouraged to use his own dialect with pride.

Many studies substantiate the view voiced by Reissman. These studies have demonstrated that amount of verbal output depends upon the social context in which the speaker finds himself (Horner & Gussow, 1970; Labov, Cohen, Robbins & Lewis, 1968; Labov, 1969). Socioeconomic status was, of course, a discriminant of language fluency and quality, but the important point was that children became more verbal when they perceived the social context as positively reinforcing of verbal output. The child is the same organism, but the environment that provides certain kinds of positive reinforcers is different from the environment in which these reinforcers are absent or negative.

It is no wonder that Labov (1968) found verbal capacities in urban blacks far above what previous investigators found. He changed the social context in which he assessed verbal output. He measured language

in peer groups outside home and school. He reports that the urban black child participates in a highly "verbal subculture where he is involved in verbal stimulation and verbal contests from morning to night."

Perhaps a better explanation than simply stating that urban black children are nonverbal would be that people who find themselves in a threatening, degrading social context tend to keep quiet. When the environment provides positive reinforcement of verbal output, the organism is verbal; otherwise, the organism shuts up and possibly appears dull to teachers. This is not nonverbal behavior, but simply smart behavior.

A good deal of evidence exists to demonstrate that lower class children have more deficient vocabularies than middle class children. Figurel (1964) states that failure to develop an adequate vocabulary prevents the disadvantaged child from reading intelligently the many middle class words which are strange to him, verbally as well as experientially. Cohen and Cooper (1972), to the contrary, report that their investigations demonstrated that urban black children have sufficient conceptual and usable vocabulary to handle the materials used to teach them reading in the beginning grades. Cohen and Kornfeld (1970) discovered

that most previous studies of black urban children's usable vocabularies underestimated their verbal repetoire. Even that underestimated assessment of vocabulary matched fairly well the vocabulary in the most widely used beginning reading books.

Cohen and Cooper (1972) emphatically state that simply because psychosocial, psychophysical, and psycholinguistic factors correlate with poor reading achievement, correlation does not mean a cause and effect relationship. They are all for eradicating racism and poverty and the effects of these social diseases, but they feel that educators need not wait for these diseases to disappear before they can teach urban disadvantaged children to read. The quality of pedagogy is what will make the difference.

The Divergent Speaker's Language as a Deficient Language System

Researchers who have taken the position that the lower class black child's language is deficient tend to view it as either verbally destitute or highly underdeveloped.

It has been known since the 1930's (Smith, 1935) that children's language varies from one social class to another. The most relevant research dealing

directly with social-class differences in language is that of the English educational sociologist, Basil Bernstein (1960). Bernstein assumes that social settings generate particular forms of communication which shape the intellectual orientation of the child. Bernstein's observations highlight the sharp contrasts between what he has labeled the "restricted code" of lower class language and the "elaborated code" of the middle class. He found that elaborated language is more individualized, specific to a particular situation or person, more differentiated, and more precise than the language of the lower class. A wider, more complex range of thought is communicated, and cognitive and affective contents are differentiated and expressed. Restricted codes, on the other hand, are highly stereotyped and limited, lacking in specificity and in the exactness needed for precise conceptualization and differentiation.

A number of studies suggest that social-class differences in language are in agreement with Bernstein's descriptions of codes, such things as speech differences in predictability, self-corrections, simpler or shorter sentences, vocabulary range, syntactic complexity, and use of subordination (Bee, et al., 1969; Deutsch, 1965,

Hess & Shipman, 1965; Osser & Harvey, 1969; Cazden, 1966).

Raph (1965) described the language of the disadvantaged child as meager and restricted, "incorrect grammatically, inaccurate in pronunciation . . . with poor syntactical form."

Bereiter and Engelmann (1966) state that disadvantaged black children are faced with a serious language and learning deficit which must be corrected before they enter the competition of the middle-class, white oriented school situation. They feel that these children are generally non-verbal and non-commital when spoken to in a normal classroom manner.

In observations of about fifty disadvantaged black preschool children, Bereiter and Engelmann (1966) suggested that the speech of severely deprived children seems to consist not of distinct words as does the speech of middle class children but of whole giant phrases which cannot be taken apart or recombined as meaningful parts. The middle class child, however, imitates specific words in sentences and leaves out words he does not know. For example, Bereiter and Engelmann point out that the middle class child would gradually build up a sentence such as "Mommy read" to

"Mommy read book" to "Mommy, I want you to read me this book" whereas the disadvantaged black child would start with some phrase such as "re-hi-bu" and never get beyond it because he would see it as a giant word and be unable to break it down. The function words would never emerge as separate and distinct words.

John and Goldstein (1964) found that the lower class child has greater difficulty in acquiring words which appear in a number of different contexts or have multiple referents. They concluded that disadvantaged children have greater difficulty in using language as a cognitive tool.

Researchers who regard the divergent speaker's language as deficient emphasize environmental deprivation as a probable cause. According to such theories, reports Stewart (1969), there is something about the lower-class black environment, both social and physical, which inhibits normal development of abstract thought and well-formed, expressive language in the growing child.

The Divergent Speaker's Language as Different

Wolfram (1971) states that linguists stand united against popular misconceptions about the so-called

illogic and cognitive limitations of non-standard dialects such as black English. Such noted linguists as Shuy, 1968; Labov, 1967; Wolfram, 1970; Baratz, 1969; Stewart, 1969; and Goodman, 1969 are in agreement that black English or black dialect is a fully formed linguistic system in its own right, with its own grammar and pronunciation rules. It cannot be dismissed as an unworthy approximation of standard English. They feel that black dialect is a well-developed, well-structured, and well-ordered language.

Wolfram (1971) reports that impressions abound that speakers of black dialect "leave things off at the end of the words, anywhere and anytime, that they forget to use the possessive and that they mistakenly use the double negative." When such characteristics are subjected to the scrutiny of analysis, it is learned that there are certain types of word-final sounds and certain grammatical rules in standard English which simply have no correspondence to rules in black dialect. Labov (1967) states that while the differences between non-standard black speech and standard English are slight compared to their similarities, some of these differences are very relevant to reading comprehension.

Labov (1967) reports that understanding differences in various dialect forms in regard to the teaching of reading may be viewed as a situation of reciprocal ignorance, where teacher and student are ignorant of each other's system, and therefore of the rules needed to translate from one system to another. He further says that some teachers are reluctant to believe that there are systematic principles in non-standard English which differ from those of standard English. They look upon every deviation from the way they speak as inherently evil. They attribute these "mistakes" to laziness, sloppiness, or the child's natural disposition to be wrong.

Black English does exist, in spite of denials that this is so. Dillard (1970) has done a thorough description of black English. The author's work in Massachusetts with blacks who did not trace their ancestry to the South and with black children all over the country indicates that the incidence of certain syntactic patterns in black children is quite high, and that these patterns are black, not Southern. Dillard shows that the idea that black children speak an inferior, error-ridden form of "low" English is totally fallacious. It is a sophisticated language

system which is simply different from standard English.

Principal Considerations in Increasing the Comprehension and Production of Standard English in the Divergent Speaker

A review of the literature indicates that three factors are paramount if students are to attain language flexibility. They are as follows:

1. primacy of oral language
2. the need to emphasize specific differences in syntax between standard and non-standard English
3. the need for sequential development from oral language and use of non-standard dialect to standard English

The relationship between oral language development and reading achievement is evidenced from a number of significant investigations. Strickland's (1962) important study of children's oral language development demonstrated that certain language patterns which children used with great frequency appear to be basic building blocks of their language. Children who ranked high on measures of comprehension in silent reading and listening were found to make greater use of movables and elements of subordination in their oral language than did children who ranked low on measures

of these variables. Strickland states that her research shows the tremendous flexibility with which children use patterns of linguistic structure in their oral language. Oral language is far more advanced than the language of the books in which children are taught to read. She feels that evidence is needed as to whether children would be aided or hindered by the use of sentences in their books more like the sentences they use in their speech.

The longitudinal study of children's language development by Loban (1963) revealed that children who were advanced in general language ability, as determined by vocabulary scores at the kindergarten level and language ratings by teachers, were also advanced in reading ability. The inverse was found for those low in general language ability. Loban concluded that competence in spoken language appears to be a necessary base for competence in reading.

Ruddell (1966) concluded that there is a high degree of interrelatedness among the various communication skills. He feels that oral language development serves as the underlying base for the development of reading and writing achievement. The child's ability to comprehend written material through reading and to

express himself through written communication appears directly related to his maturity in the speaking and listening phases of language development.

Further research by Ruddell (1965) has shown that children's reading comprehension scores at the fourth grade level are significantly higher on reading passages using only high frequency patterns of their oral language structure when compared to reading passages encompassing only low frequency patterns of their oral language.

Tatham's (1970) research supports the reported findings regarding the primacy of oral language in reading achievement. Results from her study showed that a significant number of second and fourth graders comprehend material written with frequent oral language patterns better than material written with infrequent oral language patterns. She states that for beginning readers it is logical to use children's patterns of language structure in written material to facilitate learning the concept that spoken and written language are related.

Lefevre (1962) reports that the first task of reading instruction should be to teach the pupils the same language that they have already mastered on the

unconscious operational level by the time they enter school. The pupils at this stage need to be given a conscious knowledge of their language patterns.

Goodman (1969) states that it is this vital link between written and oral language which is lacking in reading instruction for divergent speakers. The inadequacies of most present methods of reading instruction for black dialect speakers make it impossible for these children to bring their power over oral language to bear on comprehending the written language in reading. Goodman believes unequivocally that literacy must be built upon the base of the child's existing language.

Labov (1970), Stewart (1969), and Baratz (1969b) have suggested that difficulties in reading often arise from interference caused by the ignorance of differences between standard English and black dialect. Baratz states that a structural knowledge of non-standard vernacular and the ways it can interfere with learning to speak and read standard English are indispensable to teaching urban black children. Wiener and Cromer (1967) in their article on reading difficulty discussed the need to determine the relationship between language differences and reading problems.

A failure to be explicit about the relationship between reading and previously acquired auditory language often leads to ambiguities as to whether a particular difficulty is a reading problem, language problem, or both.

Linguists studying black non-standard English generally agree that the differences between this form and standard English are systematized structured rules within the vernacular. Exactly what are these syntactical differences which separate non-standard dialect from standard English?

Loban (1966), in a study of special problem areas in oral English, reported that subjects speaking non-standard dialect encounter difficulties with standard English usage in the following order of frequency: with verbs other than "to be"--lack of subject-verb agreement and use of the third person singular; omission of the auxiliary verb, especially those formed with the verb "to be"; inconsistency in the use of tense; lack of agreement in the case of the verb "to be" between subject and verb; omission of words (excluding auxiliaries); non-standard use of pronoun and noun forms; use of double negatives; omission of the verb "to be."

Labov (1967) points to difficulties which result from phonological variables such as r-lessness--the r of spelling becomes schwa or disappears before vowels and such homonyms as god for guard, fought for fort, and caught for court are obtained; the simplification of consonant clusters at the ends of words and the weakening of final consonants--a great many clusters are involved, primarily those which end in t, d, s, or z and such words as pass for past, men for mend, and wine for wind result. Labov reports that in many cases, the absence of the possessive s can be interpreted as a reduction of consonant clusters. In a similar vein, the loss of the final l has a serious effect on the realization of future forms--you'll is you, they'll is they, and he'll is he. The ed suffix which serves as the past tense marker is not used in non-standard English. The dropping of the ed suffix may also be attributed to the tendency to simplify final letters; however, there is no question about the existence of a past tense category in black dialect. For example, when a black child reads a sentence like "They guessed who he was" to sound more like "They guess who he was," this is evidence to most reading teachers that the pupil has

missed the past-tense meaning of the verb guess. Stewart (1969) states that the failure to articulate a final written ed when reading aloud no more indicates that a black child has failed to perceive the past tense meaning than when a standard speaker reads aloud, "He hit me yesterday" is an indication that he has failed to perceive the past-tense meaning of hit.

Stewart (1969), taking a different view from that of Labov, states that if there really is significant dialect interference in the reading process, it can be expected to derive from grammatical differences between black dialect and standard English, especially those which are more or less independent of non-significant phonological differences. He points to such dialect constructions as in the use of question-type inversion in black dialect verb phrases where standard English uses if (meaning whether) with no inversion. For example, "See can he go" for "See if he can go"; multiple negation in black dialect where standard English has single negation as in "He ain't never bought none" for "He hasn't ever bought any" or "He has never bought any."

Stewart also points to deeper grammatical differences which are apt to lie beyond the scope of the intuitive methods by which speakers of one dialect normally determine structural equivalences between their own and some other dialect. It is this type of grammatical difference which underlies the dissimilar use of be in black dialect and standard English. In black dialect, be is used with adjectives and the -in' (for "ing") form of verbs is used to indicate an extended or repeated state or action; for example, "He be busy" or "He be workin'." Absence of be, on the other hand, indicates that the state or action is immediate or momentary. To form a question, the auxiliary for be in black dialect--do--is used as in "Do he be busy?" Thus, be and is are entirely different morphemes in black dialect, while in standard English be and is are merely inflectional variants of the same verb. For the two grammatical constructions of black dialect, standard English has but one grammatical equivalent (e.g., He is busy, He is working) in which the immediacy or duration of the state or action is left entirely unspecified.

The last important difference which Stewart enumerates is the lack of the copula (am, is, are) of standard English in black dialect. Speakers of black dialect say "He busy" or "He be busy" instead of "He is busy" as in standard English. Taken altogether, Stewart feels that the grammatical differences between black dialect and standard English are probably extensive enough to cause reading comprehension problems.

The linguistic differences that exist between black dialect and standard English must first be acknowledged by educators before they can attempt to teach black children standard English. Although most linguists are in agreement that the speaker of black dialect must eventually be taught standard English, there is a great deal of debate about how and when during the child's education this should be done. It is difficult to find linguists who will subscribe to a position which theoretically calls for the eradication of non-standard dialect in favor of standard English (Wolfram, 1971). Linguists such as Shuy (1970), Stewart (1969), and Hoffman (1971) among others endorse a position of standard English being taught as an additive dialect to be used in

certain social situations instead of a replacive dialect which eradicates the indigenous dialect.

There are several alternatives which attempt to eliminate the possible effect that dialect differences may have in the acquisition of reading skills. It is not clear exactly how much information loss does occur because of dialect differences. Wolfram (1970) reports that at this point the most reasonable position seems to be that for the most part, the dialect speaker has a receptive competence in standard English. This position seems to be most realistic because the majority of differences between the child's vernacular and standard English appear to be on the surface rather than the underlying levels of language (Labov & Cohen, 1967). Differences on the surface level should be less imposing factors in comprehension than differences in the deep structure of the language. Wolfram and Fasold (1969) do suggest that although some lower class speakers of black dialect read extant materials with some apparent understanding, there will be an inevitable information loss.

Goodman (1969) sees three basic alternatives that schools may take in literacy programs for

divergent speakers. First is to write materials for them that are based on their own dialect, or rewrite standard materials in their dialect. Scholars such as Baratz (1969) and Stewart (1969) are proponents of dialect readers because they feel that the distance between black English and current materials is sufficiently great to warrant them. Baratz states that such a reading program would also necessitate the creation of a series of transition readers that would move the child, once he had mastered reading in the vernacular, from dialect readers to standard English texts. She talks of the powerful ego-supports of such a program by giving credence to the child's language and thereby allowing him to experience success in school.

Others, such as Shuy (1969) have suggested the neutralization of current materials by eliminating from the materials characteristics not found in non-standard black dialect. He makes clear the fact that no non-standard features present in the dialect but absent in standard English would be present in the revised materials. This strategy capitalizes on the presumed similarities of large

portions of the grammar of the two dialects so that the possibility of grammatical interference is eliminated. Venezky (1970) supports Shuy's ideas by observing that reading materials for beginning reading should in content, vocabulary, and syntax be as dialect free and as culture free as possible. He feels that given the inanity of present day materials, it should not be overly difficult to create readers which would be "neutral" with respect to dialect.

Goodman (1969) rejects the alternatives of dialect reading materials mainly on the grounds that many black parents and leaders have shown strong opposition to the idea that their children should use special materials based on a non-prestigious dialect. They usually share the view of the general culture that their speech is not the speech of cultivation, and they desperately want their children to be a part of the general culture.

Goodman's (1969) second alternative is to teach black urban children to speak the standard dialect before teaching them to read the standard dialect. Only when a child has acquired a productive

control over standard English will a teacher proceed to the teaching of reading. The teaching of reading begins with the assumption that the source for dialect interference has been eliminated. Such educators as Bereiter and Engelmann (1966) support this alternative because they feel that the child's indigenous language system is incomplete and deficient. Others such as Venezky (1970) endorse the idea of teaching standard English prior to reading for different reasons. He asserts, "Children whose dialects deviate markedly from standard English should be taught the standard brand before they are taught reading, under the explicit assumption that it is a second dialect and not a mere correct dialect that is being taught."

Goodman rejects this course because he feels that too much time would be required to teach children who are not academically oriented to another dialect of the language standard English. Black children feel no need to learn a new dialect. As Fasold (1968) notes,

> Children want to speak like their peers, and the conflicts between school and indigenous value systems have repeatedly shown that school values will most often come out on the short end of the compromise. . . . Because of the operation of social forces in the use of language, it may not be possible to teach standard English to Black dialect speaking children unless they are interacting with standard English speakers in a meaningful way outside the classroom.

Taking the optimistic view that teaching standard English would be beneficial to dialect speakers, educators cannot assume that the first grade is the best time to teach it. Some sociologists and educators suggest that it is more reasonable to start teaching standard English at an age when there is an increasing awareness of the social consequences of using certain non-standard features of speech. According to Labov (1964), the social perceptions of speech stratification start to match the adult norms around the ages of fourteen or fifteen. Feigenbaum (1969) supports Labov's view that standard English should be initiated at the

secondary level when students have acquired the notion of social appropriateness for different types of language more fully. He feels that if a student is too young to understand the concept of appropriateness, teaching standard English and when to use it will be very difficult and perhaps fruitless.

Goodman (1969) feels that the only practical alternative is the third one which involves the acceptance of dialect renderings of standard English reading materials. He states that this approach depends on acceptance by the school and the teacher of the language which the learner brings to school. Goodman is the most explicit spokesman for this position when he states, "No special materials need to be constructed, but children must be permitted, actually encouraged, to read the way they speak." If a child can read aloud a passage in such a way that it systematically differs from standard English when his indigenous dialect differs, he has successfully read the passage. For example, if a lower class black child reads a standard sentence such as "Jane goes to Mary's house" as "Jane go to Mary house" he is considered to have read it properly, since third person singular -s and possessive -s are not used in his dialect (Wolfram, 1970).

Proponents of this alternative feel that by permitting the child to read the traditional materials in his own dialect, the teacher can focus on the essentials of the reading process, and the child will not be confused about reading problems which may result from dialect interference and legitimate types of reading errors arising during the course of the acquisition of reading skills.

Goodman (1969) states that children must be helped to develop pride in their language and confidence in their ability to use it to express themselves. The teacher will speak in his own natural manner and thereby serve as a model of the general language community, but the teacher must learn to accept and to understand the children's language. He must become aware of the key areas of divergence between standard English and black dialect. Goodman cites Langston Hughes' motto for teachers of divergent speakers, "My motto as I live and learn, is dig, and be dug in return."

Summary

A review of the literature has shown that there are few absolutes in teaching reading to speakers of black dialect. Views of the divergent speaker's language were examined, and it was concluded that this

language system is not a deficient one but a sophisticated, fully formed linguistic system in its own right, which differs from standard English in specific and systematic ways. The root cause of language and reading difficulties was ascribed to structural interference, where the rules of the mother tongue blocked the acquisition of new rules. A review of the strategies for teaching reading to speakers of black dialect indicates that there is no magical solution for combating the possible effects of dialect interference in the reading process. The magnitude of the reading problem among black urban children suggests that experiments must be made with various alternatives which may involve the potential changing of materials and curricula. Perhaps most important is the changing of teacher attitudes towards intricate and unique non-standard dialects spoken in American society.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Introduction

This study investigated the possibility of the school's need to develop special strategies for teaching the dialect speaker how to read standard English. Teaching urban children to read is the most urgent task facing our schools today, especially in terms of its effect upon the rest of learning.

This chapter includes a description of the population used in the study as well as the method by which the subjects were chosen and by which the two tests which were given were selected. The details concerning the administration of the tests and the treatment of the data are also presented in this chapter.

Population

The subjects for this study were third grade students at Livingston School in New Brunswick, New Jersey. The school's population is approximately sixty percent black. The school is located in an urban area and serves many children from low-income families.

It is designated a Special Service School and is eligible to receive Title I funds.

A total of fifty students was selected for the study from the four third grade classes in the school. Thirty-one black students participated in the study. Some of the black students were placed in the standard group, for not all black people are black dialect speakers. Thirty boys and twenty girls were participants in the study.

The students who participated in the study were chosen on the basis of their non-language IQ scores on the Short Form of the California Test of Mental Maturity. Goldman (1970) states that the reliability for the non-language section of this test is .79 to .93, median .86.

Students whose non-language IQ scores were between 90 to 120 were chosen for the study. The non-language scores were used because the author was not concerned with a student's possible reading problem. The dialect group and the standard group were very similar with respect to IQ. The mean IQ scores are reported in Table 1.

The second criterion for participation in the study and for placement in either the Dialect or the Standard Group was the pupil's performance on a

TABLE 1

MEAN [illegible] LANGUAGE IQ SCORES FOR THE STANDARD AND [illegible]LECT GROUPS BASED ON THE SHORT FORM OF THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF MENTAL MATURITY N=50

Group	N	Mean IQ Score
Standard	25	101
Dialect	25	98
Total Group	50	99.8

sentence repetition test (Baratz, 1969), which consisted of thirty sentences, 15 in standard English and 15 in black dialect. (See Appendix A.) The sentences were presented on tape individually to each potential subject, who was asked to repeat each sentence after listening to it. The first twenty pupils' responses were recorded into a second tape recorder, but this procedure was discontinued as it was found to be too time consuming and made the pupils nervous. The students seemed to be more relaxed when they repeated the sentences directly to the examiner.

Each student's responses were transcribed so that they could be tallied according to certain grammatical constructions under investigation. Correct repetitions, omissions, and changes were noted. (See Appendix B.) Two separate scores were obtained for each student, one for the standard sentences and the other for the non-standard sentences. Raw scores for the standard sentences range from 0-36, while the scores for the non-standard portion of the test can vary from 0-34. Scores from 24 to 34 on the non-standard portion of the test qualified a pupil to be placed in the Dialect Group. Scores from 26-36 on the standard portion of the repetition test allowed a student to be placed in the Standard Group. The mean scores of the subjects on the standard sentences and on the dialect sentences of the repetition test are reported in Tables 2 and 3. These results support the findings of Baratz (1969). Authentic dialect speakers participated in this study. This statement is substantiated by the fact that the dialect group scored higher on repeating the non-standard sentences than did the standard group.

The sentence repetition test measures the extent to which a child has included in his speech specific

TABLE 2

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEAN SCORES OF STANDARD AND DIALECT GROUPS ON STANDARD SENTENCES FROM THE SENTENCE REPETITION TEST
N=50

Group	N	Mean Score	S.D.	*t* score
Standard	25	29.8	3.38	18.9076
Dialect	25	14.12	2.40	

t (df=48)=2.62 $p > .01$

TABLE 3

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEAN SCORES FOR THE STANDARD AND DIALECT GROUPS ON DIALECT SENTENCES FROM THE SENTENCE REPETITION TEST
N=50

Group	N	Mean Score	S.D.	*t* score
Standard	25	19.8	6.63	6.46776
Dialect	25	29	2.58	

t (df=48)=2.62 $p > .01$

grammatical characteristics associated with non-standard black dialect and with standard English. It also gives some indication of consistency in the use of these specific grammatical characteristics. Baratz (1969) previously used this test in a study conducted in an inner-city school in Washington, D.C. and an integrated low-income community in Maryland in which third and fifth graders participated. She found that "white subjects were significantly better than black subjects in repeating standard English sentences (Baratz, 1969). Significant differences between the black and white subjects occurred in the following grammatical categories: third person singular, copula, the "if" construction and negation.

Analysis of variance on the sentence repetition test of the non-standard constructions showed that race, grammatical feature and interaction of race and grammatical feature were significant beyond the .001 level. It was found that black subjects performed significantly better than white subjects in repeating black non-standard sentences.

This investigator analyzed data according to the following constructions identified by Baratz:

Standard Constructions	Non-Standard Constructions
Third person singular	Non-addition of third person singular
Presence of copula	Zero copula
Negation	Double negation; and "ain't"
"If" plus subject plus verb	Zero "if" plus verb plus subject
Past markers	Zero past morpheme
Possessive markers	Zero possessive morpheme
	Use of "be"

The investigator also looked at the following constructions:

Plural markers	Zero plural markers
First person verb agreement	Double subject
Use of "does"	Semantic elements - "ain't" "got" and "do"

Selection of Materials

Two reading passages for the study were selected from Reading for Concepts, Book C, McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, 1970. They were administered to each of the fifty subjects in both the Dialect and the Standard Groups. The passages were chosen on the basis of two factors. First, the reading level of the selection as determined by the Fry (1968) Readability Graph, had to match the actual grade level of the subjects participating in the study. The readability for both selections was third grade.

Secondly, the passages had to be of an informative and interesting nature. The length of the passage

was also considered. Selections containing approximately 200 words were desired. Longer passages may have presented a problem in the oral section of the test where the investigator read the selection to the students, and they had only the questions to be answered in front of them, not the actual selection.

Based on the above factors, the following selections were chosen: Grade 3 - "The New Way to Eat" and "Prizes for Maria." (See Appendices C and D.)

Administration of the Tests

All of the testing was done by the investigator. The sentence repetition test was given individually to determine for which group the subject qualified. Sentences, which were recorded by the author, were played on a tape to each student. The student was asked to repeat as best he could what he heard. If the student did not hear the sentence, the author played it again.

The comprehension tests were given in groups at four different times during the months of February and March. No strict time limits were imposed.

A mimeographed copy of the selection "The New Way to Eat" was given to each student along with eight questions based upon the passage. The following

instructions were given for the silent comprehension test:

1. Read the selection silently.
2. Read the questions silently.
3. Circle the correct answer or fill in the blank, as called for.
4. Wrong spelling will not be counted against you as long as I can understand what word you mean.

The instructions for the oral comprehension test were as follows after eight mimeographed questions were distributed:

1. These questions are about a passage that I will read to you. Before I do that, I will read the questions to you aloud.
2. As I read "Prizes for Maria," listen carefully for the answers to the questions.
3. Write the answers to the questions. When you get to question number 7, I will read the necessary sentence to you again.

Each student's score was the total number of correct responses on each part of the test, the silent and the oral.

Treatment of the Data

A total of correct responses on each part of the test was computed for each subject and the means of the correct standard silent and oral responses and the means of the correct dialect silent and oral

responses were derived. In addition, the means of the total standard group as opposed to the total dialect group for each part of the test were computed.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between silent and oral comprehension.

A *t* test was used to determine the significance of the difference between the means of silent and oral comprehension scores for the standard group and for the dialect group.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results of this investigation will be presented and discussed in this chapter. The hypotheses will be discussed first, and then the results will be examined and related to relevant studies reported in Chapters I and II.

Hypotheses

The First Hypothesis

The first hypothesis investigated dialect and standard speakers' performance on an oral comprehension test given in standard English. The results of the *t* test are reported in Table 4.

The differences between the mean scores of the two groups were small. The results show that the *t*-value of 1.438 was not significant. These results at the $p > .05$ level of confidence indicate that there was no significant difference between the

performance of standard and dialect speakers on the oral comprehension test. Therefore, the first null hypothesis was accepted. The level of the pupils' performance was the same regardless of dialect.

TABLE 4

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEAN SCORES OF SELECTIONS READ ALOUD TO THE STANDARD AND DIALECT GROUPS N=50

Group	N	Mean Score	S.D.	t score
Standard	25	5.96	1.37	1.4389
Dialect	25	5.28	1.93	

The Second Hypothesis

The second hypothesis investigated silent reading comprehension of standard speakers and dialect speakers by the use of a passage written in standard English. The mean scores for each group are reported in Table 5.

TABLE 5

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEAN SCORES FOR SILENT READING COMPREHENSION IN THE STANDARD AND DIALECT GROUPS N=50

Group	N	Mean Score	S.D.	t score
Standard	25	5.44	1.83	2.62232
Dialect	25	4.2	1.5	

t (df=48)=2.62; p > .01

These results do not support the hypothesis that there will be no significant difference between speakers of black dialect and non-dislect speakers in the comprehension of material read silently. The results show that the t-value of 2.6223 is significant at the (p > .01) level of confidence. The standard group scored significantly higher than the dialect group. Standard speakers seem to have a better facility in silent reading and comprehension than do the dialect speakers in this study. The auditory mode is much stronger for dialect speakers than is the silent process of decoding.

A Pearson Product Moment Correlation was computed to determine the relationship between subjects' performance on the two parts of the comprehension test. An r value of .45 was obtained. This value indicates a moderate relationship. It points to the fact that some of the students who did well on silent comprehension also did well on the oral comprehension test.

Discussion

The results of this investigation indicate that standard speakers manifest superior comprehension over dialect speakers on material read silently. This fact was not found to be true on the selection read aloud to the subjects. It is interesting to note that the mean scores for both groups were higher on the oral section of the test.

There is the possibility that third graders simply perform better when material is presented to them auditorily rather than through the process of decoding. Silent reading is a much more abstract process than understanding material which is read orally. In oral reading there are many supportive systems at work such as the reader's tone, pitch intonation, and facial expressions. All of these factors are helpful to the listener.

The results of this investigation support Goodman's (1973) and Wolfram s (1970) findings that urban children, in general, appear to acquire receptive control over other people's dialects. Goodman (1973) and Melmed (1973) both found that dialect shifts do occur between the child's oral dialect and that of the reading material. This language flexibility on the part of some children is no doubt due to the child's extended contact with standard English in the world at large. Goodman (1973) found that these dialect shifts in reading were never consistent and that poorer readers showed more dialect involvement. This information suggests that although every dialect speaker may not suffer a comprehension loss during silent reading, there is an enormous potential for interference.

Many of the studies cited in Chapter II pointed to the strong relationship between oral language development and reading achievement (Strickland, 1962; Loban, 1963; Ruddell, 1965; Tatham, 1970). They reported that children's reading comprehension was higher on material written with frequent oral language patterns from the children's speech. The primacy of oral language in teaching reading to dialect speakers must be accepted by all teachers.

The results of this investigation, even with this small population, suggest that the dialect speakers in this study understand standard English even though they do not articulate it.

All of the subjects favored the oral comprehension section of the test as exhibited by higher performance scores and fewer questions left blank. For both groups there were many more unanswered questions on the silent comprehension part of the test than on the oral part. It seems logical that the oral selection was relatively easier for below average readers than the silent selection. In silent reading the total burden of comprehension rests upon the reader. He must be able to use word attack skills well, and he must have learned the same language concepts and vocabulary that are familiar to the average standard speaking child.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A summary of the procedure and results of this study will be given in this chapter. The conclusions reached as a result of the research will be discussed and possibilities for further research will be suggested.

Summary

A comparison of oral and silent reading comprehension for standard English speakers and black dialect speakers was undertaken to determine the possible effects of black dialect upon comprehension of standard reading material. A total of fifty third grade students took part in the study, the dialect group being comprised of twenty-five students and the standard group being comprised of twenty-five. The students were assigned to either the dialect or the standard group on the basis of a sentence repetition test constructed by Baratz (1969). In order to participate in the study, a non-language IQ score within the normal range of 90 to 120 was necessary. The scores were based on the Short Form of the California Test of Mental Maturity.

The sentence repetition test which consisted of thirty sentences, fifteen in standard English and fifteen in black dialect, was administered to each potential subject individually by the investigator. In order to test the students' comprehension, two passages were selected from Reading for Concepts, Book C, McGraw-Hill Publishing Company. The selections had a readability level which matched the actual grade level of the students tested. The students were required to answer eight comprehension questions after each of the selections. Both passages were administered to the total group.

The testing was done in groups with no strict time limits imposed. All testing was done by the investigator. When the testing was completed, the mean scores for oral and silent comprehension were computed for the standard group and for the dialect group. *t* tests were used to compare the mean scores. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was also computed for the two groups.

No significant differences were found in oral comprehension between the mean scores of the standard group and the dialect group. However, the mean scores between the two groups in silent comprehension were significant at the .01 level of confidence. The

stnadard group scored significantly higher than did the dialect group. One possible reason for the lower scores by the dialect group in silent reading comprehension was dialect interference.

Another possibility is that dialect speakers are the victims of language discrimination by their teachers. It is clear that many differences exist between standard English and black dialect with respect to syntax, grammar, and vocabulary. It should be kept in mind, however, that there is a large overlap between the two dialects in syntax and in vocabulary (Venezsky, 1973). Goodman (1969) states unequivocally that teachers must accept dialect renderings of standard material. Many authorities such as Shuy (1970) and Venezsky (1970) feel that standard English and black dialect have far more similarities than differences. It is this common core of the two dialects which must be utilized in the construction of primary reading materials and in the teaching of reading to speakers of black dialect. Shuy (1970) and Venezsky (1973) conclude that there is no reason why the textbook developers cannot "neutralize" primary reading material by restricting vocabulary, syntax and semantics to a common core which is already known by the majority of standard and non-standard speakers. No

non-standard features which are present in the dialect but absent in standard English would be present in the revised materials. Primary reading materials could be developed which would be valid for many dialects within the United States.

It is noteworthy that both groups in this study scored higher on the oral comprehension selection than on the silent comprehension selection. These findings suggest that the auditory mode is a crucial process in the teaching of primary children. Teachers should be trained to use this modality with greater expertise and frequency. This approach will give the dialect speaker opportunities to relate to the models of his teacher and his standard speaking peer group. Gradually he may become more proficient in the use of standard English.

The results of this investigation agreed with findings from other studies that dialect interference is a possible source of reading difficulties in black dialect speakers. A causal relationship, however, was not conclusively proven by this study. The lack of significant differences between the groups on the oral comprehension scores shows that these dialect speakers do have receptive control over standard English. The significant differences between the standard and the

dialect groups on the silent comprehension passage suggests that new methods and approaches could be more effeective in teaching black dialect speakers to read standard English.

Conclusions

The results of this investigation show that the third graders in this study performed better in comprehension when a passage was read aloud to them. This result suggests that teachers need to find methods for giving students more auditory input. The auditory mode seems to be a highly important one for children in this age group.

Another important result showed that the dialect speakers who participated in the study scored significantly lower than the standard speakers in silent comprehension of a reading passage written in standard English. This result supports the well known fact that dialect speakers are not learning how to read properly. Educators must find ways in their teaching to take advantage of the many similarities between black dialect and standard English.

It is very possible that writing, rather than simply being talk written down, is a different language process from that involved in reading. If this is the case, then teaching strategies

would have to be cognizant of this difference.

Suggestions for Further Research

Further research in the area of the effect of black dialect upon reading comprehension might incorporate the following suggestions:

1. A replication of this study at a different grade level to see if the results are similar with respect to oral and silent comprehension scores would be valuable to see if students scored similarly to the subjects in this study.

2. A similar study using passages in black dialect as well as passages written in standard English to test the comprehension of the two groups would be of interest.

3. A replication of this study using a larger population would give greater importance to the findings.

4. A similar study using the cloze test to assess comprehension skills could provide useful information comparing the reading processes of dialect and standard speakers because it would tell us how they conceptualize and choose language.

5. A comparison of teaching methods which rely more on the auditory sensory mode since studies reveal

that young children learn more readily through this approach.

6. The effect on children of teachers trained to understand the linguistic aspects of dialect similarities and differences should be studied.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baratz, J. Teaching reading in an urban Negro school system. In J. Baratz and R. Shuy (Eds.), Teaching black children to read. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969a.

Baratz, J. Linguistic and cultural factors in teaching reading to ghetto children. Elementary English, 1969b, 46, 199-203.

Bereiter, C., & Engelmann, S. Teaching disadvantaged children in the preschool. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Bernstein, B. Language and social class. British Journal of Sociology, 1960, 11, 271-276. In F. B. Davis (Ed.), The literature of research in reading with emphasis on models.

Black, M. H. Characteristics of culturally disadvantaged children. The Reading Teacher, March, 1965, 18, 465-470.

Cohen, S. A., & Cooper, T. Seven fallacies: Reading retardation and the urban disadvantaged beginning reader. The Reading Teacher, October, 1972, 26, 38-45.

Cohen, S. A., & Kornfeld, G. Oral vocabulary and beginning reading in disadvantaged children. New York: Reading and Language Arts Center, Yeshiva University, 1970.

Cuban, L. To make a difference. New York: The Free Press, 1970.

Dillard, J. Black English in the United States. New York: Random House, 1970.

Fasold, R. W. Isn't English the first language too?," Milwaukee, Wisc.: NCTE Annual Conference, 1968.

Feigenbaum, I. Using foreign language methodology to teach standard English. In A. C. Aarons, B. Gordon, and W. A. Stewart (Eds.), Linguistic-cultural differences and American education, The Florida Reporter, 1969, 116-122, 156-157.

Figurel, J. Limitation in the vocabulary development of disadvantaged children: A cause of poor reading. Improvement of reading classroom practice. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association, 1964, 160-175.

Goldman, B. A. In The seventh mental measurements yearbook. O. K. Buros (Ed.). Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon Press.

Goodman, K. Dialect barriers to reading comprehension. In J. Baratz and R. Shuy (Eds.), Teaching black children to read. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969a.

Goodman, K. Let's dump the uptight model in English. Elementary School Journal, 1969b, 70, 1-13.

Goodman, K., & Buck, C. C. Dialect barriers to reading comprehension revisited. The Reading Teacher, 1973, 27 (1), 6-12.

Goodman, P. Universal trap. Profile of a school dropout. New York: Random House. D. Schreiber (Ed.).

Hess, R. D., & Shipman, V. C. Early experience and the socialization of cognitive modes in children. Child Development, 1965, 36 (4), 869-886.

Horn, T. (Ed.). Reading for the disadvantaged, problems of linguistically different learners. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1970.

Horner, V., & Gussow, J. John and Mary: A pilot study in linguistic ecology. In J. Cazden and Hymes (Eds.), Functions of language in the classroom. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

John, V. P., & Goldstein, L. S. The social context of language acquisition. Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 1964, 10, 265-276.

Johnson, K. R. The language barrier-A crisis in the education of black children. Chicago, Ill.: School of Education, University of Illinois, 1968.

Labov, W. Stages in the acquisition of standard English. In R. Shuy (Ed.), Social dialects and language learning. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964.

Labov, W. Some sources of reading problems for Negro speakers of non-standard English. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, pp. 140-167, 1967.

Labov, W., & Cohen, P. Systematic relations of standard and non-standard rules in the grammar of Negro speakers. Project Literacy Report, No. 8. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, 1967.

Labov, W., Cohen, P., Robbins, C., & Lewis, J. A study of the non-standard English of Negro and Puerto Rican speakers in New York City. Cooperative Research Project #3288. New York: Columbia University, 339-348, 1968.

Lefevre, C. Linguistics and the teaching of reading. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Loban, W. The language of elementary school children, a study of the use and control of language and the relations among speaking, reading, writing and listening. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

Loban, W. Problems in oral English, kindergarten through grade nine. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1966.

MacGinitie, W. Testing reading achievement in urban schools. Reading Teacher, October, 1973, 27 (1), 13-21.

McDavid, R. Dialectology and the teaching of reading. In J. Baratz and R. Shuy (Eds.), Teaching black children to read. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Melmed, P. J. Black English phonology, the question of inteference. In J. L. Laffey and R. Shuy (Eds.), Language differences, do they interfere. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association, 1973.

Raph, J. Language characteristics of culturally disadvantaged children: Review and implications. Review of Educational Research, 1965, 35, 373-400.

Reissman, F. The overlooked positives of disadvantaged groups. In J. Frost (Ed.), The disadvantaged child. New York: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1966.

Ruddell, R. The effect of oral and written patterns of language structure on reading comprehension. Reading Teacher, 1965, 18, 270-275.

Ruddell, R. Oral language and the development of other language skills. Elementary English, May, 1966, 43, 489-498.

Silberman, C. Give slum children a chance. Harper's Magazine, 1964, 51-62.

Shuy, R. A linguistic background for developing beginning reading materials for black children. In J. Baratz and R. Shuy (Eds.), Teaching black children to read. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Smith, M. E. A study of some factors influencing the development of the sentence in pre-school children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1935, 46, 182-212.

Stewart, W. A. On the use of Negro dialect in the teaching of reading. In J. Baratz and R. Shuy (Eds.), Teaching black children to read. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Strickland, R. G. The language of elementary school children: Its relationship to the language of reading textbooks and the quality of reading of selected children. Bulletin of the School of Education. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University, 1962.

Tatham, S. M. Reading comprehension of materials written with select oral language patterns: A study at grades 2 & 4. Reading Research Quarterly, Spring, 1970, 402-426.

Venezky, R. L. Non-standard language and reading. Elementary English, 1970, 47, 334-345.

Venezky, R. L., & Chapman, R. S. Is learning to read dialect bound. In Language differences. Do they interfere. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association, 1973.

Watson, G. A critical evaluation of the yearbook. Journal of Negro Education, 1964, 33, 343-345.

Wiener, M., & Cromer, W. Reading and reading difficulty: A conceptual analysis. Harvard Educational Review, 37, 620-643.

Wolfram, W. A., & Fasold, R. W. Toward reading materials for speakers of black English: Three linguistically appropriate passages. In J. Baratz and R. Shuy (Eds.), Teaching black children to read. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Wolfram, W. A. Sociolinguistic alternatives in teaching reading to nonstandard speakers. Reading Research Quarterly, Fall, 1970, 6, 11-33.

Wolfram, W. A. Who's to say: Controversies over what linguists can and cannot say about nonstandard dialects. Dimension: Languages '71: A world without walls. Proceedings of the Seventh Southern Conference on Language Teaching. Atlanta, Georgia, 1971.

Wood, M. H. An analysis of beginning reading programs for the disadvantaged. In Understanding: Prerequisite for teaching disadvantaged children. Bloomington, Ind.: School of Education, Indiana University, 1970, pp. 149-182.

APPENDIX A

SENTENCE REPETITION TEST

1. That girl, she ain't go ta school 'cause she ain' got no clothes to wear.
2. John give me two books for me to take back the liberry 'cause dey overdue.
3. I's some toys out chere and the chil'run they don' wanna play wid dem no more.
4. Does Deborah like to play with the girl that sits next to her in school?
5. The teacher give him a note 'bout de school meetin' and he 'posed to give it ta his mother to read.
6. John he always be late for school 'cause he don't like ta go music class.
7. My aunt who lives in Baltimore used to come to visit us on Sunday afternoons.
8. Do Deborah like to play wid da girl that sit next ta her at school?
9. I asked Tom if he wanted to go to the picture that was playing at the Howard.
10. John gave me two books to take to the library because they were overdue.
11. Can Michael make the boat by hisself or do we gotta he'p him do it?
12. Henry lives near the ball park but can't go to the games because he has no money.
13. Where Marry brovah goin wif a raggedy umbrella and a old blue raincoat?
14. There are some toys out here that the children don't want to play with any more.

APPENDIX A (Continued)

15. If I give you three dollars will you buy me the things that I need to make the wagon?

16. When the teacher asked if he had done his homework, Henry said, "I didn't do it."

17. I aks Tom do he wanns go to the picture that be playin' at the Howard.

18. Henry live beside the ball park but he can't go to the games 'cause he ain't got no money.

19. The teacher gave him a note about the school meeting to give to his mother.

20. She was the girl who didn't go to school because she had no clothes to wear.

21. John is always late to school because he doesn't like to go to music class.

22. Patricia sits in the front row so that she can hear everything the teacher says.

23. If I give you three dollar you gonna but what I need to make the wagon?

24. When the teachah aks Henry did he do his homework, Henry say I ain't did it.

25. My aunt, she live in Baltimore, and she useda come visit us Sunday afternoon.

26. Gloria's friend is working as a waitress in the Hot Shoppes on Connecticut Avenue.

27. Can Michael build the boat all by himself or should we help him with some of the work?

28. Where is Mary's brother going with a raggedy umbrella and an old blue raincoat?

APPENDIX A (Continued)

29. Patricia all the time be sittin' in the front row so she can hear everything the teacher say.

30. Gloria frien', she a waitress, she be working the Hot Shoppes on Connecticut Avenue.

APPENDIX B

TRANSCRIPTION SHEET FOR THE SENTENCE REPETITION TEST

Name_____ Teacher_____ Sex_____

Date_____ Dialect or Standard Group_____

Part I - Standard Sentences

1. Does Deborah like to play with the girl that sits next to her?
   (Do)

2. My Aunt who lives in Baltimore used to come visit us on Sunday afternoons.

3. I asked Tom if he wanted to go to the picture that was playing at the Howard.

4. John gave me two books to take to the library because they were overdue.
   (give)

5. Henry lives near the ball park but can't go to the games because he has no money.

6. There are some toys out here that the children don't want to play with any more.
   (Is)

7. If I give you three dollars will you buy me the things that I need to make the wagon?

APPENDIX B (Continued)

8. When the teacher asked if he had done his homework, Henry said, "I didn't do it."

---

9. The teacher gave him a note about the school meeting (give) to give to his mother.

---

10. She was the girl who didn't go to school because she had no clothes to wear.

---

11. John is always late to school because he doesn't like to go to music class.

---

12. Patricia sits in the front row so that she can hear everything the teacher says.

---

13. Gloria's friend is working as a waitress in the Hot Shoppes on Connecticut Avenue.

---

14. Can Michael build the boat all by himself or should we help him with some of the work?

---

15. Where is Mary's brother going with a raggedy umbrella and an old blue raincoat?

APPENDIX B (Continued)

Part II - Non-Standard Sentences

1. That girl, she ain't go ta school 'cause she ain' got no clothes to wear.

---

2. John give me two books for me to take back the liberry 'cause dey__ overdue.

3. Is some toys out chere and the chil'run they don wanna play wid dem no more.

4. The teacher give him a note 'bout de school meetin' and he ___ 'posed to give it ta his mother to read.

5. John he always be late for school 'cause he don't like ta go to music class.

6. Do Deborah like ___ to play wid da girl that sit_ next to her at school?

7. Can Michael make the boat by hisself or do we gotta he'p him do it.

8. Where Mary brovah going wif a raggedy umbrella and a old blue raincoat?

9. I aks Tom do he wanna go to the picture that be playin' at the Howard.

10. Henry live_ beside the ball park but he can't go to the games because he ain't got no money.

11. If I give you three dollar_ you gonna buy what I (are) need to make the wagon?

12. When the teacher aks Henry did he do his homework, Henry said, "I ain't did it."

13. My aunt she live_ in Baltimore and she useda come visit me Sunday afternoon_.

14. Patricia all the time be sittin' in the front row so she can hear everything the teacher say__.

APPENDIX B (Continued)

15. Gloria___frien'___she a waitress, she be working the Hot Shoppes on Connecticut Avenue.

---

1. Copula_____
2. Possessive_____
3. 3rd person verb agreement_____
4. Negation_____
5. Plural_____
6. If plus subject plus verb (d0)_____
7. past marker_____
8. 1st person verb agreement_____
9. "Ain't," "got," "do" and "be"_____

Code

\+ correct repetition

\- shifted to own dialect

o didn't answer

APPENDIX C

"PRIZES FOR MARIA"

The following selection was used for the oral comprehension part of the study. The selection was from Reading for Concepts, Book C, McGraw-Hill Book Company.

1. A young Indian girl, Maria Martinez of San Ildefonso (san il da fon so), liked to make pottery. In 1908, some men came to New Mexico to study the Indians. They saw the pottery that Maria had made. They thought it was very beautiful. They asked her to copy pottery made by early Indians.

2. Many potters use a wheel. They put the clay on a circle that spins around. As the clay turns, they push it into the shape they want. American Indians like Maria do not use a wheel. They roll their clay into long ropes like a snake. They wind the ropes to build sides. While the clay is wet, they press the ropes together. They paint the pottery in colors made from rocks. They bake the pottery over beds of hot coals.

3. Maria found a way to make black pottery. It was different from pottery found anywhere else in the world.

APPENDIX C (Continued)

Maria made pottery for more than fifty years. She used only material found near her home. Her pottery became famous. She won prizes from America and other countries.

APPENDIX C (Continued)

COMPREHENSION QUESTIONS FOR "PRIZED FOR MARIA"

1. Maria Martinex lived in

   a. California c. Utah

   b. New Mexico d. Arizona

2. The word in the story that means bowls or pots made of clay is _____.

3. The story says: "Maria made pottery for more than fifty years. She only used material found near her home. The word she means _____.

4. The story does not say this, but from what we have read, we can tell that

   A. the early Indians could not make pottery well.

   B. some Indians still make pottery the old way.

   C. anyone can win a prize for old pottery.

5. How do the Indians color their pottery?

   A. They paint the pottery in colors made from rocks.

   B. They paint the pottery in colors made from coal.

   C. They paint the pottery in colors made from chalk.

APPENDIX C (Continued)

6. The main idea of the whole story is that
   A. Maria used a wheel to make pottery.
   B. The American Indians made clay snakes.
   C. An Indian girl made very fine pottery.
7. The word in paragraph 2, sentence 5, that is the opposite of unroll is _____.
8. Which of the following does the story lead you to believe?
   A. Most Americans do not like pottery.
   B. It is easy to make black pottery.
   C. Fine Indian pottery is admired throughout the world.

APPENDIX D

THE NEW WAY TO EAT

1. Eating in space is different from eating on earth. The food that astronauts carry with them does not look like the food you eat.

2. Some food is carried in closed bags. It is cooked and frozen before the astronauts get it. All the water is removed from the food. In the capsule, the astronaut puts the water back. He "shoots" hot or cold water into the food bag with a special gun. He eats the food through a small hole in the bag.

3. Other foods come in bite sizes. The astronaut puts a whole piece in his mouth at once. There can be no crumbs. Crumbs would float around the capsule and get in the way. Meat, cake, and cereal often come in bite sized pieces.

4. Astronauts cannot drink water from open cups. The water would float in drops in the air. The water is put in the special gun. The astronaut shoots the water into his mouth.

5. Eating in space is not easy. Astronauts must learn to eat this way.

APPENDIX D (Continued)

COMPREHENSION QUESTIONS FOR "A NEW WAY TO EAT"

1. Some space foods are carried in
   a. water guns c. closed bags
   b. lunch boxes d. crumbs
2. The word in the story that means a man who flies in space is _____.
3. The story says: "The food that astronauts carry with them does not look like the food you eat." The word them takes us back to the word _____.
4. The story does not say this, but from what we have read, we can tell that
   A. You get much hungrier in space than you do on earth.
   B. You cannot have water to drink in a space capsule.
   C. Astronauts must learn many new and different things.
5. Why can't astronauts drink water from cups? (Which sentence is exactly like one from the story?)
   A. The water would float in drops in the air.
   B. The water would spill all over their food.
   C. Crumbs and cereal would float in the cups.

APPENDIX D (Continued)

6. The main idea of the whole story is that
   A. there is more food and water in space than on earth.
   B. eating and drinking in space is a special problem.
   C. astronauts can never eat or drink in a space ship.
7. The word in paragraph 3, sentence 4, that is the opposite of sink is _____.
8. Which of the following does the story lead you to believe?
   A. Food for astronauts must be made in a special way.
   B. Astronauts will only eat cakes made from crumbs.
   C. All meat on earth comes in bite seized pieces.